DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 633 SP 028 522

AUTHOR Zide, Michele Moran; And Others
TITLE Five Years of Success: A Collaborative Staff Development Model That Works.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Staff Development; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Fitchburg State College MA

ABSTRACT

Five years of designing and implementing staff development projects between Fitchburg State College (Massachusetts) and local school districts has led to the development of a collaborative planned change model. This model and six exemplary projects implemented in public schools in three districts are described in this paper, and each project is further described in a matrix indicating the components of the model which were operational in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the project. Projects described are: (1) Facilitating Support Groups for Teachers; (2) Behavior Management Stategies for Mainstreamed Special Education Students; (3) School and Classroom Behavior Management Strategies; (4) Integrating Computer Technology in the Curriculum; (5) Mathematics and Science Curriculum Revision K-12; and (6) The Psycho-Linguistic Approach to Language. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278633

"Five Years of Success: A Collaborative Staff Development Model That Works"

Michele Moran Zide, Ed. D.
Special Education Department
Fitchburg State College
Fitchburg, MA 10420

Patrice LeBlanc, MA
Special Education Department
Lura A. White School
Shirley, MA 01464

Patricia McAllister M.Ed.
Elementary Education Department
Johnny Appleseed School
Leominster, MA 10453

Concetta Verge, M. Ed.
Principal, Passios Elementary School
Lunenburg, MA 10462

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.M. Zide

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP 028 522

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

II. The Model

III. The Characteristics

IV. Brief Description:
Six Staff Development/In-Service Programs

V. Checklist:
Characteristics of Successful Collaborative Staff Development Programs

VI. Matrix:
Model for Successful Collaborative Staff Development and Exemplary Programs

VII. Conclusion

VIII. References

INTRODUCTION

The past five years of designing and implementing staff development projects between Fitchburg State College and local school districts has lead to the development of a collaborative planned change model. The model has been developed through research and experience in implementing collaborative projects. This model and six exemplary projects implemented in public schools in three districts are described in this paper. Each project is further described in a matrix. In the matrix, presented on page 12, are indicated the components of the model which were operational in the planning, implementation and evaluation of a given project.

THE MODEL

The model has been effective in producing long term change within the school systems. Programs based on the model have been successful in producing desired change for both administrators and teachers. These programs have worked in a wide range of settings, at different grade levels and in various content areas.

The research used in model development comes from three distinct areas: staff development, organizational development and collaborative programs. It is the meshing of these areas that makes the model so successful. The matrix lists the key characteristics of the model with exemplary projects, identified by titles across the top.

THE CHARACTERISTICS

The first characteristic of successful collaborative programs is the collaborative relationship. This relationship has a two component definition: 1> commitment and 2> interface with the organization. The current literature on collaborations defines the relationship in several ways. Trubowitz's (1984) description of what his project members viewed the meaning of collaboration as "included ongoing dialogue, the development of trusting relationships, and cooperative decision making." Appley and Winder (1977) term the components of collaboration as consciousness, caring, commitment and choice. The matrix defines the collaborative relationship as a mix of: commitment of time, resources and sharing of responsibilities. What sets this model apart from other models described in the literature is the second component to the definition of collaboration: interface with the organizations. The collaborative participants must bring to the project an understanding for the ways in which their own organizations work. It is the interface of each organization's goals and the ability of the participants to bring the power of information, resources and

support to the project that are crucial for successful collaboration.

Planning is the second characteristic of successful collaborative staff development programs. Educational planning typically includes needs assessment, goal setting, activity development and evaluation. Successful collaborative planning must take into account that the organizations involved may have diverse goals, different methods of decision making and their organizational environments may vary greatly. Therefore, the planning process must be flexible, allowing for maximum input from a variety of sources, and it must result in a jointly articulated and supported program goal.

The concept of support is the third characteristic. This support comes both directly and indirectly, ranging from direct participation by administrators to the establishment of a supportive climate for change. This support must come from each organization to ensure successful collaboration. It is a key characteristic identified in the literature on collaborations, staff development and planning.

The last two characteristics are based upon the current research in staff development. Wood, Thompson and Russell (1981) make several points in their discussion of program design. These include: knowledge, attitude and skill objectives in training; experiential learning; choices for participants; and opportunities for feedback. Sparks (1983) suggested school based programs with training sessions separated to allow time for teacher practice and adaptation of techniques. The works of these authors and others also recommend the active involvement of participants in programs and the establishment of a climate for growth and change.

The matrix organizes the concepts cited in the literature around two characteristics: school based programs and active involvement. The programs listed on the matrix exemplify the variety of options for school based programs. The component of active involvement delineates the process of the training program including: 1> a positive climate, 2> pre/post test evaluation, 3> a clearly defined learning process and 4> a clearly visible product. The learning process evidences multiple methodologies: information, demonstration, critique and selection of techniques, practice, peer observation, feedback, peer coaching and teamwork. It therefore provides a variety of experiences which result in teachers developing knowledge, skills and attitudinal changes. Staff growth results in the final product- an increase in student achievement.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: Six Staff Development/In-Service Programs

1. Facilitating Support Groups for Teachers.

Purpose and Process:

The purpose of this project was to increase staff confidence and feelings of worthiness after the effects of a substantial reduction of staff and support services were experienced as a result of Proposition 2.5.

Twelve teachers, selected based on interest, from five elementary schools, the junior high school and the high school participated in fifteen seminars which focused on the skills needed to facilitate support groups for teachers.

The twelve facilitators, after six initial training sessions, teamed to co-facilitate support groups for teachers in five school buildings. One hundred and eighty teachers from the system were invited to participate in the support groups. Fifty-five teachers registered for a ten week support group program.

The support group facilitators continued to meet weekly with the college consultant while facilitating the support groups. During these seminars the co-facilitators shared their experiences and discussed the progress of their respective support groups. They also helped develop the pre+post test instrument which was administered to all the the support group participants.

Planning:

Collaborative planning by teachers, administrators and college faculty.
Three member planning team.

Options for Credit:

Facilitating Support Groups for Teachers:
3 graduate credits.

Support Groups:
3 system in-service credits

Funding:

The Commonwealth In-Service Institute.
The College Voucher System.

Duration:(Fall, 1982 - Spring, 1983)

Six months.

Evaluation:

Pre and post testing.
Analysis and evaluation of assigned projects.

Location:

Leominster Public Schools
Leominster, Ma 10453

Contact Person:

Ms. Patricia McAllister
Johnny Appleseed School
North Main Street
Leominster, MA 01453

2. Behavior Management Strategies for Mainstreamed Special Education Students

Purpose and Process:

The purpose of this project was to increase staff awareness, sensitivity and quality of direct service provided to special needs students in the mainstream.

Teachers in the Shirley, Ma. school system had completed an in-service priority survey which indicated that they desired training in the area of mainstreaming special needs students. A twelve week training program was collaboratively designed by a special education staff member from the local school system and a college faculty member. The goals of the in-service program were to: review Bloom's Educational Domains; examine teacher expectations for students in various classroom situations and in different locations in the school building; examine teaching methodology; study successful teaching practices in teaching the basic skills; study behavior management techniques addressing curriculum and methodological adaptation practices for various typologies of special needs students; discuss teacher-student relationships as well as relationships between special education staff and the regular classroom teachers and administrators, discuss communication practices and experiences between home and school and study and practice the clinical supervision model.

Planning:

Collaborative planning of content and methodology by college faculty and teachers.
Two member planning team.

Options for Credit:

3 graduate credits.

Funding:

The Commonwealth In-Service Institute.

Duration:(Spring, 1984)

Five months

Evaluation:

Pre and post testing.
Analysis and evaluation of assigned projects.

Location:

Lura A. White School
Shirley, Ma 01464

Contact Person:

Ms. Patrice LeBlanc
Lura A. White School
Shirley, Ma 01464

3. School and Classroom Behavior Management Strategies

Purpose and Process:

In this particular project the Leominster School System administered a questionnaire to all staff for the purpose of developing a staff development course to meet staff needs. The highest priority was "behavior management techniques" for the classroom teacher. A first grade teacher and a college faculty member came together to design a course to meet the teachers' needs. After the course was designed, six trained facilitators teamed with ten untrained facilitators to participate in a facilitator training workshop to enable them to work together to co-facilitate small groups to meet the course goals.

The goals of the in-service program were to: review Bloom's Educational Domains, examine teacher expectations for students in various classroom situations and in different locations in the school building; examine teaching methodology; study successful teaching practices in teaching the basic skills; study behavior management techniques; address curriculum and methodological adaptation practices; discuss teacher-student relationships as well as relationships between special service providers and the regular classroom teachers and school administrators; discuss communication practices and experiences between home and school; and study and practice the clinical supervision model.

Planning:

Collaborative planning by college faculty and teacher.
Two member planning team.

Options for Credit:

3 graduate credits for facilitators.
3 graduate credits for teachers and administrators who chose the credit option for the Behavior Management course.

Funding:

The Commonwealth In-Service Institute.
The College voucher system.

Duration:(Spring, 1984)

Five months.

Evaluation:

Pre and post testing.
Analysis and evaluation of assigned projects.

Location:

Leominster Public Schools
Leominster, Ma 10453

Contact Person:

Ms. Patricia McAllister
Johnny Appleseed School
North Main Street
Leominster, MA 01453

4. Integrating Computer Technology in the Curriculum

Purpose and Process:

This three year project was collaboratively designed by a teacher from the Shirley school system and a faculty member from Fitchburg State College. The project involved two local separate, yet similar school systems.

First year goals addressed by teachers and staff were to familiarize self selected teachers and administrators with the history of computers, with an understanding of how computers work and to enable teachers to use computers in the classroom in a variety of ways. Selected staff teams met weekly with college faculty and consultants to study basic computer terminology and functions, to examine, evaluate and purchase software for use in basic subject areas, to master word processing programs, and to integrate purchased software into the instructional process in the classroom. Additionally, a team of teachers designed a progressive computer literacy unit of study for students at each grade level.

During the second year of the project, teachers continued to: take formal course work on location; function as team members to accomplish system based projects; develop a cataloguing system for software; reevaluate the existing basic skills curriculum; integrate software as suggested resources in the curriculum; interface with existing curricula committees within the systems; work on established computer committees within each system. In addition, in-service workshops were provided for other teachers in the system not directly involved in the more comprehensive project activities. Project consultants from the college and from within the school systems offered seminars and workshops on a regular basis for project participants and any other interested staff members.

The final year of the project continued to provide teachers with the opportunity to take formal courses. Three year project participants received a certificate in Educational Technology from Fitchburg State College. In addition, in-service opportunities based on staff needs were provided for all interested staff within the systems including teachers of students in low incidence groups. Students with special needs, gifted and talented, and those receiving additional special instructional opportunities were the target population for the third year of the project. A team of teachers studied the use of the computer as an instructional and motivational device for these students and wrote a paper addressing this issue. Cataloguing, evaluating, and purchasing software were additional activities which continued through the life of the project. It is expected that the outcomes of this project will continue to benefit the systems long after the project is completed.

Planning Component:

Collaborative planning among the administrators and teachers representing the two school districts and college faculty.
Six member planning team.

Options for Credit:

Graduate credits for courses.
No credit for system in-service workshops and seminars.

Duration:(Fall, 1984 - Spring, 1987)

Three years.

Funding:

Board of Regents of Higher Education.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Fitchburg State College
Project Director:

Dr. Michele Moran Zide
Special Education Department
Fitchburg State College
Fitchburg, MA 01420

Evaluation:

Bi-monthly monitoring reports.
Pre and post testing.
Analysis and evaluation of assigned projects.
Summative evaluation reports at the end of each year.
Outside evaluation at the end of three years.

Location:

Lura A. White School
Shirley, Ma 01464
and
Passios Elementary School
Lunenburg, MA 01462

Contact Person:

Ms. Patrice LeBlanc
Lura A. White School
Shirley, Ma 01464

5. Mathematics and Science Curriculum Revision K-12

Purpose and Process:

The major goals of the Mathematics and Science Curricula Revision project were to revise the Mathematics and Science curricula, provide in-service to all teachers teaching these subjects K-12, integrate selected software programs in these curricular areas and to continue to select software to support the revised curricula. Fitchburg State College faculty from the mathematics, science, special education and computer science departments and Leominster Public Schools administrators and teachers in mathematics and science department participated in project planning, implementation and evaluation.

In order to achieve its major goals, Fitchburg State College faculty,teachers and local administrators developed 12 sub-goals. They included: setting up the organization to include a Project Planning Committee, Curricula Piloting Committee and Task Force; meeting with outside readers to provide evaluation of written materials; deliver documentation for summative evaluation of the curricula including student performance; pilot test the curricula; set up a special education task force to examine the revised curricula and to recommend the use of the curricula in direct service provided to students in resource room settings K-12; purchase computers, peripherals and software appropriate to address the goals and objectives of the mathematics and science curricula.

As a result of the project, the Leominster Public Schools have a mathematics and science curricula K-12. The curricula was developed by the staff and all teachers have been trained to implement it at each grade level. Computers and software are being used by students and staff in laboratories and in classrooms. All teaching staff are computer literate.

Planning:
Collaborative planning among teachers, administrators and college faculty.
Five member planning team.

Options for Credit:
No credit.

Duration: (Fall, 1984 - Spring, 1987)
Three years.

Funding:
Board of Regents of Higher Education.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts to Fitchburg State College

Project Director:
Dr. Michele Moran Zide
Special Education Department
Fitchburg State College
Fitchburg, MA 01420

Evaluation:
Bi-monthly monitoring reports.
Summative evaluation reports at the end of each year.
Outside evaluation at the end of three years.

Location:
Leominster Public Schools
Leominster, Ma 10453

Contact Person:
Ms. Patricia McAllister
Johnny Appleseed School
North Main Street
Leominster, MA 01453

6. The Psycho-Linguistic Approach to Language

Purpose and Process:

This course included the basic theory of psycho-linguistics, general principles of the theory as it relates to language and the various methods and techniques used in its implementation. The target population included self selected classroom teachers, speech and language specialists and special educators who had previous in-service training in language impairments.

The group met four days a week for three weeks and were provided daily with the opportunity to hear lectures, observe a language impaired class taught by a master teacher, and implement the psycho-linguistic approach to language through providing direct instruction to language impaired students. The direct instruction opportunities were video taped and analyzed by the course participants. The teachers also developed units of study incorporating the psycho-linguistic approach to language in the subject areas of science, social studies, and reading. The teachers were provided with the existing curricula in each of these subject areas, they viewed video presentations and were provided with an analysis of units previously constructed. The newly developed units were to be used by teachers during the upcoming academic year.

Planning:

The course was designed and proposed for credit by a Lunenburg staff member and the school principal.
The course was approved for credit by the Graduate Dean and the appropriate departmental chair.
A graduate faculty member provided minimal assistance and observed the course in progress.

Options for Credit:

3 graduate credits.

Funding:

The Lunenburg Public School System.
Teachers paid an off campus registration fee.

Duration: (Summer, 1986)

Three weeks.

Evaluation:

Pre and post testing.
Analysis and evaluation of assigned projects.

Location:

Lunenburg Public Schools
Lunenburg, MA 10462

Contact Person:

Ms. Concetta Verge, Principal
Passios Elementary School
Lunenburg, MA 01462

CHECKSHEET: CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

I. **Collaborative Relationship**
   1. Commitment
      a. time
      b. resources
      c. sharing responsibilities
   2. Interface with organizations
      a. structure
      b. communication
      c. support

II. **Planning**
   1. Need assessment
      a. informal
      b. formal
   2. Planning Team
      a. input
      b. goals development
      c. program activities
      d. monitoring
      e. evaluation

III. **Administrative Support**
   1. Direct
   2. Indirect

IV. **School Based**
   1. Options for credit
      a. graduate
      b. system assigned
      c. no credit
      d. in-service (attendance required)
   2. Duration
      a. flexibility
      b. time-line
      c. sessions at regular intervals
   3. Savings
      a. commuting time
      b. external funding sources
   4. Observation/participation opportunities

V. **Active Involvement**
   1. Positive climate
   2. Pre/post test evaluation
   3. Learning process
      a. information
      b. demonstration
      c. critique and selection of techniques
      d. practice
      e. peer observation
      f. feedback
      g. peer coaching
      h. team work
   4. Product
      a. curricula development
      b. generation of teaching materials
      c. long term teacher change
      d. increases in student achievement

MATRIX: MODEL FOR SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

	1. Facilitating Support Groups for Teachers	2. Behavior Management Strategies for Mainstreamed SPED Students	3. School and Classroom Behavior Management Strategies	4. Integrating Computer Technology into the Curricula	5. Mathematics and Science Curricula Revision K-12	6. The Psycho-Linguistic Approach to the Teaching of Reading
I. Collaborative Relationship						
1. Commitment						
a. time	X	X	X	X	X	X
b. resources	X	X	X	X	X	X
c. sharing responsibilities	X	X	X	X	X	
2. Interface with organizations						
a. structure	X	X		X	X	X
b. communication	X	X	X	X	X	X
c. support		X	X	X	X	X
II. Planning						
1. Need assessment						
a. informal				X	X	X
b. formal	X	X	X	X		X
2. Planning Team						
a. input	X	X	X	X	X	X
b. goals development	X	X	X	X	X	X
c. program activities	X	X	X	X	X	X
d. monitoring	X	X	X	X	X	X
e. evaluation	X	X	X	X	X	
III. Administrative Support						
1. Direct	X		X	X	X	X
2. Indirect	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV. School Based						
1. Options for credit						
a. graduate	3	3	3	18		3
b. system assigned	3					3
c. no credit		X				
d. in-service (attendance required)	1 SESSION		1 SESSION	16 SESSIONS	8 SESSIONS	
2. Duration						
a. flexibility	X			X	X	X
b. time-line	5 MONTHS	1 SEMESTER	1 SEMESTER	3 YEARS	3 YEARS	8 WEEKS
c. sessions at regular intervals	X	X	X	X	X	X
3. Savings						
a. commuting time	X	X	X	X	X	X
b. external funding sources	X	X	X	X	X	
4. Observation/participation opportunities	X	X	X	X	X	X
V. Active Involvement						
1. Positive climate	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Pre/post test evaluation	X	X	X	X		X
3. Learning process						
a. information		X	X	X		X
b. demonstration	X	X	X	X	X	X
c. critique and selection of techniques	X	X	X	X	X	X
d. practice	X	X	X	X	X	X
e. peer observation	X	X	X	X	X	X
f. feedback	X	X	X	X	X	X
g. peer coaching	X		X	X	X	X
h. team work	X		X	X	X	X
4. Product						
a. curricula development				X	X	X
b. generation of teaching materials		X	X	X	X	X
c. long term teacher change	X	X	X	X	X	X
d. increases in student achievement		X	X	X	X	X

CONCLUSION

Educators are encouraged to use the "Characteristics of Successful Collaborative Staff Development Programs" as a checklist for developing planned change efforts in educational systems. The model is effective in addressing a broad range of topics and various staff development needs as evidenced by the exemplary programs. It suggests a process for school administrators, education staff and university or college faculty to work together to achieve desired ends. The model: (1) provides a vehicle for all parties to have maximum in-put in needs assessment, planning and decision making; (2) requires commitment from both the public school and the college to support each activity implemented to meet the defined goals; (3) necessitates securing human and financial resources in order to comfortably meet realistic goals; and (4) requires an on-going monitoring and evaluation system to measure the effectiveness of the process and the strategies implemented to meet the goals.

A collaborative planned change project should have a defined beginning and end. The time-line for each project should be realistic that is, it should match clearly defined goals and result in curricula products as out-puts. The project outcomes should be measurable, observable and tangible. The personnel involved in such collaborative activities should be recognized by the leaders in their systems' for effecting change, and for assuming responsibilities that reach beyond the traditional teacher or faculty role.

School administrators should encourage teachers to be involved in and to assume leadership roles in planned change collaborative projects. These projects have demonstrated that when college faculty, school administrators and teachers work together and share the resources of healthy dynamic systems, the quality of education provided to students is enhanced and teacher motivation is increased. A collaborative staff development project enables a school to move toward the level of excellence public school students so richly deserve.

REFERENCES

Appley, D. E. and A. E. Winder. "An Evolving Definition of Collaboration and Some Implication for the World of Work." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13, 3 (1977); 279-290.

Duke, Daniel L. and Lyn Corno. "Evaluating Staff Development." Staff Development/Organizational Development. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, 1981: 93-111.

Gayner, Alan K., Karl H. Clasut, Jr. Planning for Education Development. Boston University (unpublished), 1984.

Hersey, Paul. Ken Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior; Utilizing Human Resources (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1982).

Patterson, Jerry L., Stewart C. Purkey, and Jackson V. Parker "Productive School Sytems for a Nonrational World." Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.

Sparks, Georgea Mohlman. "Synthesis of Research on Staff Development for Effective Teaching." Educational Leadership, November (1983): 65-72.

Trubowitz, Sidney, et. al."When a College Works with a Public School." Institute for Responsive Education, 1984.

Wood, Fred H., Steven R. Thompson, and Sr. Frances Russell. "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs." Staff Development/Organizational Development. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, 1981: 59-91.